

# The Momentum Four-Vector in the $\psi$ N Formalism and the Angular Momentum Imparted to Test Particles by Gravitational Waves

Asghar Qadir\*, M. Sharif<sup>†</sup> and M. Shoaib  
Department of Mathematics, Quaid-i-Azam University,  
Islamabad, Pakistan

## Abstract

Since gravitational waves are solutions of Einstein's field equations with a zero stress-energy tensor, the reality of these waves was questioned. To demonstrate it, the momentum imparted to test particles by such waves was evaluated. A closed form expression for this quantity was provided by Qadir and Sharif, using an extension of the pseudo-Newtonian formalism. That formalism carried with it the zero component of the momentum vector, which could not be interpreted as the energy imparted to the test particle. Sharif proposed that it may represent the angular momentum imparted to test particles by gravitational waves. In this paper it is shown that this interpretation is not valid. An alternative explanation has been provided.

**PACS:** 04.20 Classical general relativity,  
04.20.Cv-Fundamental problems and general formalism,  
04.30 - Gravitational waves: theory.

---

\*Senior Associate, Abdus Salam International Center for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy

<sup>†</sup>Permanent address: Department of Mathematics, Punjab University, Lahore-Pakistan.

# 1 Introduction

Einstein's General Relativity (GR) predicts the existence of gravitational waves as solutions of the vacuum Einstein equations [1]. The significance of these solutions as gravitational waves was questioned on account of the fact that they cannot possess any energy, since the stress-energy tensor is zero. The problem was resolved by Ehlers and Kundt [2], Pirani [3] and Weber and Wheeler [4], by considering test particles in the path of the waves. It was shown that these particles acquired momentum from the waves. The standard procedure [5] to evaluate the momentum is fairly complicated. Qadir and Sharif [6] provided a closed form expression for the momentum imparted in arbitrary spacetimes, using an extension [7] of the pseudo-Newtonian ( $\psi$ N) formalism [8]. The original formalism applied to only static spacetimes and, in the appropriate Fermi Walker frame [9], gave a purely spatial force vector. Its extension to non-static spacetimes introduced a zero component for the force vector. The problem was to interpret this extra term. The original  $\psi$ N force could be expressed as the gradient of a scalar potential but the spatial part of the  $e\psi$ N force had to be written as the spatial gradient of one potential and the zero component as the time derivative of another. This was not satisfactory. The alternative method [6] of treating the force 4-vector as the proper time derivative of the momentum 4-vector was adopted. This procedure provided the momentum imparted to test particles by gravitational waves as

$$p_\mu = \int F_\mu dt, \quad (1)$$

where

$$F_0 = m[(\ln(\frac{A}{\sqrt{g_{00}}}))_{,0} - \frac{g_{,0}^{ij}g_{ij,0}}{4A}], \quad (2)$$

$$F_i = m(\ln \sqrt{g_{00}})_{,i}, \quad (3)$$

$$A = (\sqrt{-\det(g_{ij})})_{,0}. \quad (4)$$

In this paper the problem of identification of the zero component of the momentum 4-vector was mentioned. Sharif [10] proposed that it could be interpreted as the spin imparted to test rods. In the next section this suggestion will be reviewed and it will be demonstrated that it does not work. To find an alternative check on its validity, the geodesic analysis [2] for the

angular momentum imparted to test articles by gravitational waves is undertaken in sect. **3**. Finally, in the conclusion a proposal for the interpretation of the zero component of the momentum 4-vector is discussed.

## 2 Spin Imparted to Test Particles by Gravitational Waves

Sharif [10] considered a test rod of length  $\lambda$  in the path of a gravitational wave whose preferred direction is given by  $l^i$  in the preferred reference frame. It was argued that the maximum angular momentum imparted would be

$$S^i = p_0 l^i, \quad (5)$$

where  $l^i$  is the vector representing the rod. Thus the maximum angular momentum imparted to a test rod, when it lies in the plane perpendicular to the preferred direction, is

$$S = p_0 \lambda = m \lambda \int [(\ln(Af))_{,0} - g_{,0}^{ij} g_{ij,0} / 4A] dt. \quad (6)$$

Hence the physical significance of the zero component of the momentum 4-vector would be that it provides an expression for the spin imparted to a test rod in an arbitrary spacetime.

This formula was applied to plane and cylindrical gravitational waves to give, respectively, a constant  $S$  and

$$S = -m \lambda [(1 + A J_0 / \omega \rho J'_0) \ln |1 - 2 A \omega \rho J'_0 \cos(\omega t)| + constant]. \quad (7)$$

Notice that here can be no spin angular momentum imparted to test particles in a perfectly homogeneous and isotropic cosmological model; its high degree of symmetry, in particular, spherical symmetry - is incompatible with spin being imparted to particles. However when we use the above formula for cosmological models, it gives exactly this error [11]. For example, consider the Friedmann model, which is isotropic and homogeneous. For the flat Friedmann model

$$S = m \lambda \ln \frac{\eta}{2}. \quad (8)$$

For the closed Friedmann model there was a problem, as a straight forward application of the formula led to an infinite value of  $F^0$  at the phase of maximum expansion. This arose because the coefficient of  $F^0$  in the constraint

equation vanished. The problem was resolved by re-setting the zero of acceleration at the phase of maximum expansion. Setting  $S$  to zero at the phase of maximum expansion.

$$S = m\lambda[\ln \sqrt{1 - \cos \eta} - \frac{3}{8} \cos \eta + \frac{1}{16} \cos^2 \eta + \ln \sqrt{2} + \frac{5}{16}]. \quad (9)$$

For the open Friedmann model

$$S = -m\lambda \ln \frac{\sinh \eta}{\cosh \eta - 1}. \quad (10)$$

Equations (8), (9) and (10) give a non-zero spin imparted to test particles by flat, open, and closed Friedmann models. Since no spin can be imparted, the spin interpretation of  $p_0$  cannot be correct.

For the De Sitter universe in usual coordinates the spin turns out to be constant and in the Lemaitre form to be

$$S = -m\lambda(\Lambda/3)^{1/2}t + \text{constant}. \quad (11)$$

This does not seem reasonable, because for the former version we could get rid of the spin by choosing the constant to be zero, while for the latter we cannot. Thus it is clear that the interpretation is not even internally consistent.

### 3 The Geodesic Analysis for the Angular Momentum Imparted to test Particles in Various Cosmological Models

Consider a time-like congruence of world lines ( not necessarily geodesic) with tangent vector  $u^a$ . Decompose  $u_{a;b}$  by means of the operator  $h_{ab}$  projecting into the infinitesimal 3-space orthogonal to  $u^a$  [2]:

$$u_{a;b} = -\omega_{ab} + \sigma_{ab} + \frac{1}{3}\vartheta h_{ab} - \dot{u}_a u_b, \quad (12)$$

where

$$-\omega_{ab} \equiv u_{[a;b]} + \dot{u}_{[a} u_{b]}, \quad \dot{u}_a = u_{a;b} u^b, \quad (13)$$

$$\vartheta \equiv u^a_{;a}, \quad h_{ab} = g_{ab} + u_a u_b, \quad (14)$$

$$\sigma_{ab} \equiv u_{(a;b)} + \dot{u}_{(a}u_{b)} - \frac{1}{3}\vartheta h_{ab} \quad (\sigma_a^a = 0). \quad (15)$$

For an observer along one of the world lines and using Fermi propagated axes,  $\omega_{ab}$  describes the velocity of rotation,  $\sigma_{ab}$  shear and  $\vartheta$  the expansion of the cloud of neighboring free particles. Since the  $\psi$ N-formalism uses the Fermi-Walker frame, it could be expected that the results of this analysis should be consistent with it, as indeed they are for the momentum imparted. For our purpose only  $\omega_{ab}$  is needed. Choose the coordinates so that the tangent vector is  $u^a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g_{00}}}\delta_0^a$ . Thus, from eq.(13) we have

$$\omega_{i0} = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \begin{matrix} 0 \\ 0 & i \end{matrix} \right\} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3), \quad (16)$$

for the cases when  $g_{00} = 1$ . For the Friedmann or the Lemaitre form of the De Sitter universe this gives zero. Even for the De Sitter universe in usual coordinates we get a zero spin, as required. For the Gödel universe the spin turns out to be the physically reasonable.

$$\omega_{10} = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{am^2(x)}{l(x) + m^2(x)}, \quad \omega_{20} = \omega_{30} = 0. \quad (17)$$

For gravitational waves we have to introduce a procedure so that the spacetime is Minkowski before the wave arrives and acquires a non-static metric afterwards. The geodesic analysis for gravitational waves is given elsewhere [12] as it is not directly relevant here. The expressions are quite complicated, involving delta functions so as to incorporate the step function on the metric. They are consequently omitted here.

## 4 Conclusion

In the absence of any momentum 3-vector and  $F_0$ , we should be able to identify  $p_0$  with  $E$ . Thus we define

$$\Delta E = p^0 - E = g^{00} \int F_0 dt - [(m^2 - p^i p^j g_{ij})^{\frac{1}{2}} + m], \quad (18)$$

where the last term corresponds to an integration constant. Let us calculate this difference for the three cases of the Friedmann metric. They give  $\Delta E = S/\lambda$ , with  $S$  given by eqs.(8), (9) and (10) for the corresponding cases.

The three expressions have the same asymptotic behavior for sufficiently small values of  $\eta$ , namely  $\Delta E \sim m \ln \eta$ . At the phase of maximum expansion of the closed model we get  $\Delta E = m(\ln 2 + 3/4)$ . We could equally well have set  $\Delta E = 0$  at the phase of maximum expansion and had a difference for it from the other two cases for small  $\eta$  (in the constant term). Note that for all the three models  $\Delta E$  diverges as  $\eta$  goes to zero and it also diverges as  $\eta$  goes to  $2\pi$  for the closed model. For  $k = +1$  we have chosen to display the constant term so  $\Delta E$  for the closed Friedmann model with  $m$  taken to be unity. This becomes infinite at the bang and the crunch and becomes zero at the phase of maximum expansion.  $\Delta E$  for the flat Friedmann model, again  $m$  is taken to be unity.  $\Delta E$  diverges at the bang only.  $\Delta E$  for the open Friedmann model, again  $m$  is taken to be unity. Again,  $\Delta E$  diverges at the bang only. that  $\Delta E = 0$  at  $\eta = \pi$ . The proposal does not seem inconsistent, but still needs further discussion. For this purpose we shall briefly recall the key points of the definition of the  $e\psi$ N-force.

The original  $\psi$ N-formalism, constructed for static spacetimes only, was based on the observation that even in free-fall the tidal force can be operationally determined by an accelerometer consisting of two masses connected by a spring, whose end can move as a needle on a dial. Using Riemann normal coordinates, the extremal value of this tidal force gives the directional derivative of the relativistic analogue of the Newtonian gravitational force, called the  $\psi$ N-force. The extension to non-static spacetimes was achieved by retaining the requirement of Riemann normal coordinates spatially, but dropping it temporally. Consequently, a "memory" of the zero-setting of the accelerometer is built into the formalism. Note that in the case of the closed Friedmann model the "memory" comes from the phase of maximum expansion rather than from the bang, or any other time prior to the present.

The fact that  $F_0$  has the zero setting built into it is the key to the interpretation of both  $F_0$  and  $p_0$ . Essentially, as  $F_0$  has the dimensions of power, it should correspond to the "power" imparted to the test particle, or absorbed from it, by the gravitational field of the spacetime. For a static spacetime this would be zero, as energy would be conserved. However, in a time-varying spacetime there must be energy imparted to, or withdrawn from, all (test) particles in it. This would provide a direct measure of the extent of non-conservation of energy in the spacetime.

The interpretation of  $p_0$  in the  $\psi$ N-formalism is now clear. It is the *extra* energy imparted to test particles or extracted from them) by the gravitational field, in the following sense. The energy imparted, as at the time considered,

relative to the spacetime then is the usual.

$$E_T = E + \int F_0 dt = E + p_0. \quad (19)$$

It should be borne in mind that  $p_0$  can be negative. It may also be remarked that the previously introduced "second potential",  $U$ , is the same as  $p_0$  (up to an arbitrary constant of integration, not fixed for either of them).

The question still unanswered is how to convert this *measure* of the gravitational energy of the field into an actual expression for it, without reference to the test particle. The problem is that the mass of the test particle enters into the expression for the energy. The problem is that the mass of the test particle enters into the expression for the energy. One would be tempted to replace it by  $\rho dV$ , and use the energy density in the spacetime to obtain  $\rho$ . This procedure cannot work. To see this, consider a gravitational wave spacetime. Clearly, it does not have any stress-energy tensor, and hence one would have to put  $\rho = 0$ . However, there is obviously a gravitational energy in the field,  $p_0 \neq 0$ , in general.

One needs to, somehow, use the very gravitational energy of the field we are trying to evaluate to give the required  $\rho$ . How this is to be done is not clear at present.

## Acknowledgments

One of us (AQ) would like to thank Prof. R. Ruffini for financial support at ICRA, where some of this work was done and two of us (AQ and M. Shoaib) would like to acknowledge the Quaid-i-Azam University Research Fund for support facilities for this work.

## References

- [1] Misner C.W., Thorne K.S. and Wheeler J.A., *Gravitation* (W.H. Freeman, San Francisco) 1973.
- [2] Ehlers J. and Kundt W., *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, edited by L. Witten (Wiley, New York) 1962, p. 49.
- [3] Pirani F.A.E., *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, edited by L. Witten (Wiley, New York) 1962, p. 199.

- [4] Weber J. and Wheeler J.A., Rev Mod. Phys., **29**(1957)509.
- [5] Weber J., *General Relativity and Gravitational Waves* (Interscience, New York) 1961.
- [6] Qadir A. and Sharif M., Phys. Lett. **A167**(1992)331.
- [7] Qadir A. and Sharif M., Nuovo Cimento **B107**(1992)1071;  
Sharif M., Ph.D Thesis, Quaid-i-Azam University (1991).
- [8] Qadir A., Nuovo Cimento **B112**(1997)485;  
Mahajan S.M., Qadir A. and Valanju P.M., Nuovo Cimento **B65**(1981) 404;  
Quamar J., Ph.D. Thesis, Quaid-i-Azam University (1984);  
Qadir A. and Quamar J., *Proceedings of the Third Marcel Grossman Meeting on General Relativity*, edited by Hu Ning (Science Press and North Holland Publishing Co.) 1983, p. 189.
- [9] Qadir A. and Zafarullah I., Nuovo Cimento **B111**(1996)79.
- [10] Sharif M., Astrophys. Space Sci., **253**(1997)159.
- [11] Sharif M., Astrophys. Space Sci., **262** (1999)297.
- [12] Shoaib M., M. Phil dissertation, Quaid-i-Azam University (1999).